

Remarks

Claims 1-21 are pending.

This Supplemental Response incorporates by reference the Amendment Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.116, filed on June 5, 2006.

It is submitted that the Amendment deals with the objections to Claims 1, 11 and 21. Entry of the Amendment is requested.

It is noted with appreciation that the Examiner states in the Advisory Action that the Rejections under Section 112, second paragraph, will be withdrawn in view of the Amendment.

It is submitted that the Remarks of the Amendment deal with the rejections of Claims 1, 3-5, 8-12, 14-16 and 19-21 under Section 102(a), and the rejections of Claims 2, 6, 7, 13, 17 and 18 under Section 103(a).

As to the Examiner's remarks in the last paragraph on page 2 of the Advisory Action, regarding the "installer" being "inherent" to Berghel et al., the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider and respond to the detailed arguments set forth on page 9, last paragraph, through page 11, next to last paragraph, of the Amendment.

As to the Examiner's remarks on page 2 of the Advisory Action, regarding Zimniewicz et al., "add[ing] nothing to Berghel," actually what was stated in the Amendment at page 16, in the third paragraph under the section dealing with the rejections under Section 103(a), was that (*emphasis added*):

Zimniewicz et al., which does not disclose any Primary Data Stream file or any Alternate Data Stream file, adds nothing to Berghel et al. *regarding writing a Primary Data Stream file or an Alternate Data Stream file to a New Technology File Structure logical volume from an installer to render Claims 1 or 11 unpatentable.*

Furthermore, it was expressly noted in footnote 2, that the Examiner's comments regarding Zimniewicz et al. on page 4 of the Office Action do not pertain to Claims 1 or 11.

Reconsideration and early allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Kirk D. Houser
Registration No. 37,357
Attorney for Applicant